

Areas 1 through 4 are scored based on the rating scale provided for each area. A total score will range from 0 – 14. Typically, competitive proposals have a score of 8 and above.

Area 1: Project Goals/Feasibility

| <i>3: High</i> | <i>2: Medium</i> | <i>1: Low</i> | <i>0: Unacceptable</i> |
|--|--|--|--|
| Project description is easily understood by a non specialist reader. Goals of the project are clearly explained and feasible within the given timeline; the tasks of the student and faculty are clearly described; the faculty member has demonstrated content/methodological expertise; a detailed proposed timeline is provided; there is evidence of careful, detailed consideration of the budgetary and other resources necessary for completion of the project. | Project description is reasonably clear to a non-specialist reader. Goals of the project are adequately stated; the tasks of the student and faculty are adequately described; the faculty member has sufficient content/methodological expertise; a proposed timeline is provided; there is evidence of reasonable consideration of the budgetary and other resources necessary for completion of the project | Project description is not easily understood by a non-specialist reader. Goals of the project are unclear and/or vague; the tasks of the student and faculty are not sufficiently described; the faculty member has not demonstrated content/methodological expertise; the proposed timeline is unclear and/or vague; there is minimal evidence of consideration of the budgetary and other resources necessary for completion of the project. | Project description is unclear to a non-specialist reader. Goals of the project are not present; the tasks of the student and faculty are not described; the faculty member did not address content/methodological expertise; the proposed timeline is not feasible, or not present; there is no evidence of consideration of the budgetary and other resources necessary for completion of the project. |

Area 2: Mentorship/Apprenticeship Plan

| <i>4: Exceptional</i> | <i>3: High</i> | <i>2: Medium</i> | <i>1: Low</i> | <i>0: Unacceptable</i> |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Goals and mentoring approach are clearly described, explained, and tailored to the student applicant; the student and faculty member have intentionally begun preparation for this project, and this has been clearly described; the plan for the scholarly development of this student is clearly described and thoughtfully crafted. | Goals and mentoring approach are clearly described and explained; the student and faculty member have intentionally begun preparation for this project; the plan for the scholarly development of this student is clearly described. | Goals and mentoring approach are adequately described; the student and faculty member have begun preparation for this project; a plan for the scholarly development of a student is described. | Goals and/or mentoring approach are not adequately described; insufficient details on how the student and faculty member have begun preparation for this project; a plan for the scholarly development of a student is not sufficiently described. | Goals and/or mentoring approach are missing; unclear if student and faculty member have begun preparation for this project; a plan for the scholarly development of a student is not provided. |

Area 3: Student Preparation and Motivation (URC Note: If résumé or CV is missing or poorly written, deduct 1 pt from this section)

| <i>4: Exceptional</i> | <i>3: High</i> | <i>2: Medium</i> | <i>1: Low</i> | <i>0: Unacceptable</i> |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| This section is student driven and demonstrates a clear understanding of the project goals, methodologies, and nature of their contribution; they are highly qualified to pursue the project; they present compelling and clearly articulated learning goals, and how this experience will aid in achieving their professional and academic goals. | The student statement reflects strong understanding of project goals and nature of their contribution; the student demonstrates that they are highly qualified to pursue the project; the student statement is compelling and clearly articulates their learning goals, as well as how this experience will aid in achieving professional and academic goals. | The student statement reflects an adequate understanding of project goals and/or nature of their contribution; the student demonstrates that they are qualified to pursue the project; the student statement articulates their learning goals or how this experience will aid in achieving professional and academic goals. | The student statement reflects a limited understanding of project goals and/or nature of their contribution; there are concerns about the student qualifications for the project; the student statement inadequately describes their learning goals or how this experience will aid in achieving professional and academic goals. | The student statement reflects an insufficient understanding of project goals and/or nature of their contribution; the student does not demonstrate that he/she is qualified to pursue the project; the student statement does not articulate learning goals or how this experience will aid in achieving professional and academic goals. |

Area 4: Commitment to Project

| <i>3: High</i> | <i>2: Medium</i> | <i>1: Low</i> | <i>0: Unacceptable</i> |
|--|---|---|--|
| Both student and faculty member detail and describe their summer obligations and approach to balancing these, in a way that clearly prioritizes the MS3 project. | Both student and faculty member describe their summer obligations and appear to prioritize the MS3 project. | Both student and faculty member describe their summer obligations but the MS3 project is not clearly prioritized. | Neither the student nor faculty member detail or describe their summer obligations and the MS3 project is not prioritized. |